

Community Scoping Meetings: Draft EIS Terms of Reference
Tuktoyaktuk: October 12, 2010

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
General	Members of Tuktoyaktuk expressed interest that they want a road, but that they prefer the upland route.		
Routing: Preferred Route	Questions and comments were raised asking why and how the preferred route was selected.		Section 6.1, 7.2
	Concerns were expressed about the term “preferred route” and the previous lack of consultation on this route.	<i>The term “preferred route” applies to the Developer’s preferred route.</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2
		<i>You have alternate routes on the map but I don’t think you’re really considering them.</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2
		<p><i>The currently proposed preferred route is not much different from the 1977 PWC route. The Inuvialuit didn’t have input into the route then, as the IFA was not yet negotiated. There is a lot of spiritual value in Husky Lakes.</i></p> <p>The Developer responded that the route now includes a 1000m setback from Husky Lakes.</p>	Section 6.1, 7.2
Husky Lakes Setback	Comments were raised regarding the adequacy of the setback from Husky	<i>In the past, the Elders asked for a 10-mile setback from Husky Lakes. The road is</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2

	Lakes.	<i>too close to our traditional areas where we depend on livelihood year round.</i>	
Routing: Upland Route	Some meeting attendees voiced their preference for the Upland Route.	<i>The Upland route is what most of Tuktoyaktuk prefers. The highway is proposed on Inuvialuit lands and crown lands. But we are also Canadian. As a landowner, we should be able to influence how the highway is built on private land.</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2
Routing: Other		<i>Could you put the road beside the [proposed] pipeline?</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2
		<i>Will the proposed route continue on the existing 177 route access?</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2
Project Cost and Funding	The Developer confirmed that the preferred route is estimated to cost \$2 million per mile.	<p><i>If you go back to the dates [on the slide], does this mean you have the money for the road?</i></p> <p>The Developer responded that the GNWT is in discussions with the Federal Government, who consider the project a high priority and are confident funding could be found over some years.</p>	Section 6.3
		<p><i>Have you asked for funding from oil companies?</i></p> <p>The Developer stated that they have not requested funding from oil companies.</p>	Section 6.3
		<i>Has anyone considered a toll for the road? The money could go towards</i>	Section 6.3

		<i>maintenance.</i>	
		<p><i>How much funding is required for the road, and will construction begin before all of the funding is secured?</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response.</p>	Section 6.3
	Comments were raised in response to the Developer's statement that the preferred route is more economic than the upland route.	<p><i>To me, you can't put a dollar figure on Husky Lakes. To me it costs more than \$2 million, costs more than that road. If I had known it would come to this, I would have pushed for more [protection of Husky Lakes] during the land claim settlement.</i></p> <p><i>I respect the developer's story (re: costs). They've got to respect mine too.</i></p>	Section 2.0 Section 12.0
	Questions were asked about maintenance costs.	<i>What is the difference in maintenance costs for the different routes?</i>	Section 6.3
Land Transfer	Questions and comments were raised regarding how the land would be transferred from the Inuvialuit to the Territorial Government, and the extent of land that would be transferred.	<p><i>I'm assuming this will be a public highway, under the GNWT highway system. This means we're giving up some of the administration of the land to the Federal/Territorial government.</i></p> <p>A representative from the ILA provided a response regarding the land transfer process to date.</p> <p>The Developer responded that road maintenance will be contracted to businesses in the communities.</p>	Section 10.2.9

		<i>What is the width of the road Right-of-Way (RoW)? How much land will be taken from the ILA?</i>	Section 6.0 Section 10.2.9
Project Construction and Schedule	Meeting attendees asked questions and raised concerns about construction and the construction schedule.	<i>Why can't the road be built in summer as well as in winter?</i> The Developer and the EIRB representative provided a response.	Section 6.0
		<i>In the winter, this is when we make our livelihood, and when we use the land. The disruption will be greatest in winter.</i>	Section 2.0 Section 12.0
		<i>Who will be engineering the road access and gravel material? Who will monitor the road construction, to ensure it is probably built and maintained?</i> The EIRB representative responded that the EIRB will use technical expertise to make sure the EIS is followed.	Section 13.2
Stream Crossings	Meeting attendees requested more information about stream crossings.	<i>People should also be given more information about the stream crossings, the culverts, where they are. You should give us the specific locations so that we can review them and give you our feedback.</i>	Section 6.0 Section 7.0 Section 10.1.4
	Meeting attendees discussed the number of stream crossings required by each of the preferred route and upland route.	<i>Do they know how many streams they're crossing?</i> The Developer replied that the preferred	Section 6.0 Section 7.0 Section 10.1.4

		route will require 42 stream crossings.	
		<p><i>I have travelled the upland route with skidoo. I didn't cross any streams.</i></p> <p>The Developer responded that while the upland route requires fewer stream crossings, it would require finding and paying for large amounts of fill (gravel).</p>	<p>Section 6.0 Section 7.0 Section 10.1.4</p>
		<i>The upland route has no water crossings.</i>	<p>Section 6.0 Section 7.0 Section 10.1.4</p>
Gravel	In response to the Developer's statement that the upland route requires more gravel, meeting attendees provided input on the availability of gravel and fill sources on the upland route.	<i>I have travelled the upland route and observed available gravel and fill.</i>	<p>Section 6.0 Section 7.0</p>
	Meeting attendees asked for information about gravel sources and activities and provided input.	<p><i>People have brought gravel from Inuvik and Tuktoyaktuk lost opportunities to provide it.</i></p> <p>The ILA representative responded, providing information about the Granular Resources Management Plan.</p>	<p>Section 6.0 Section 7.0</p>
		<p><i>Could there be stockpiling gravel on the highway route during summer?</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response. Gravel has to be thawed out for moisture to escape. There is a possibility to stockpile the gravel.</p>	<p>Section 6.0 Section 7.0</p>

		<i>There is good gravel in Yaya lakes. Has the developer thought of the gravel sources?</i>	Section 6.0 Section 7.0
Terrain	Meeting attendees asked questions about the differences in terrain (hills) between the preferred and upland routes.		Section 6.0 Section 7.0 Section 10.1.1
Permafrost and Slumping	Meeting attendees asked questions and provided input about permafrost and slumping, and differences in between the preferred and upland routes.	<i>Did you include permafrost slumping in your studies?</i> The Developer responded that the road will be laid on top of the existing terrain to prevent permafrost slumping.	Section 10.1.1
		<i>There might be slumping in the low land areas [along the preferred route].</i>	Section 6.0 Section 7.0 Section 10.1.1
		<i>The upland route might be cheaper and cost less for maintenance because the preferred route would have much more frost heaving.</i>	Section 6.0 Section 7.0 Section 10.1.1
Tourism and Socioeconomic Impacts	Comments were raised regarding increased tourism and the influx of tourists, as well as socioeconomic impacts.	<i>Once the road is built, where are all the people that travel here for tourism going to stay?</i> The Developer provided a response regarding their limitations in managing people using the road. The ILA representative and EIRB	Section 10.2

		representative provided separate responses about the measures that can be used to manage people using the road.	
Management and Monitoring: General		<i>If the highway goes ahead, we would need at least a couple of maintenance camps. Elders could be hired to monitor the amount of traffic between Inuvik and Tuk. Camps could also be used for training.</i>	Section 12.0
Management and Monitoring: Husky Lakes	Meeting attendees raised concerns about impacts to Husky Lakes and asked how these will be managed.	<p><i>At one time, we requested a Husky Lakes Management Board. Now we have a conflict because the Husky Lakes Management Board hasn't started and we development.</i></p> <p>A representative from the ILA referred to the Husky Lakes Management Plan, which requires the 1000m setback from Husky Lakes. The ILA further proposed an alternate route to avoid the incursions of the preferred route into the setback.</p>	Section 12.0
		<i>[Re: impacts to Husky Lakes] Who is going to manage the road, and how?</i>	Section 12.0
		<i>[Re: increased access to Husky Lakes, new people in area] The land will change. How will this be managed?</i>	Section 12.0
Management and Monitoring: Fish	Meeting attendees expressed concerns about potential impacts to fish stocks and the need for a management plan.	<i>One of the concerns is that there hasn't been a fish study on either side of the road. There needs to be a management</i>	Section 10.6.1 Section 12.0

		<i>plan. We would really like to have more funding to do some studies of fish species and quantities. If this road comes in, we're very concerned about the fish stocks.</i>	
Review Process	Meeting attendees asked for information about the Review Process and schedule.	<p><i>What is the schedule for the review?</i></p> <p>The EIRB representative provided a response.</p>	
		<p><i>Do we not have a say in the route after this? [refers to Review Process schedule – submission of EIS]</i></p> <p>The EIRB representative provided a response.</p>	
		<p><i>In the end, who will decide the route?</i></p> <p>The EIRB representative provided a response that the recommendations from the EIRB will go forward into the regulatory process.</p>	
	Meeting attendees asked for other project-related information.	<p><i>I understand there were wildlife studies done. What has been done, and how can we access that information?</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response about the availability of information in the Project Description Report.</p>	
		<i>There should be condensed versions of the project documents for people in the</i>	

		<i>communities to learn about how the road will be developed and maintained. This will help reduce some fears about impacts of the road.</i>	
--	--	--	--